COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE MESSAGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
SERVICE TARIFF OF CINCINNATI BELL) CASE NO. 89-024
TELEPHONE COMPANY)

ORDER

("Cincinnati Bell") shall file an original and 12 copies of the following information with the Commission, with a copy to all parties of record. Each copy of the data requested should be placed in a bound volume with each item tabbed. When a number of sheets are required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 1(a), Sheet 2 of 6. Include with each response the name of the witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to ensure that it is legible.

The information requested is due no later than March 27, 1989. If the information cannot be provided by this date, a motion for an extension of time must be submitted stating the reason for the delay and the date by which the information can be furnished. The Commission will give due consideration to such motions.

1. Provide a jurisdictional separations study in sufficient detail to show total interstate and intrastate and interLATA and intraLATA revenue requirement by principle service category.

2. Provide a present and proposed priceout of the tariff filing in this case using the most recent available 12 months of demand units.

3. Assuming all other things constant and no absorption, from which service(s) would Cincinnati Bell propose to recover the revenue reduction that results from the tariff filing in this case?

4. Assuming all other things constant, will absorption of the revenue reduction that results from the tariff filing in this case impact Cincinnati Bell's revenue requirement in subsequent test periods? If the response is "no," please thoroughly explain Cincinnati Bell's reasoning.

5. Does Cincinnati Bell agree that the tariff filing in this case results in intrastate intraLATA toll rate deaveraging? For the purposes of this response, assume that Cincinnati Bell's market area is a LATA. Also, if the response is "no," please thoroughly explain Cincinnati Bell's reasoning.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 10th day of March, 1989.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ATTEST:

Executive Director